

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings includes changes to Fig. 6 and 7.

The first sheet, which includes Fig. 6, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 6. In Figure 6, the labels have been corrected from a "900"-series of numerals to a "600"-series of numerals, as suggested by the Examiner.

The second sheet, which includes Fig. 7, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 7. In Figure 7, the labels have been corrected from a "1000"-series of numerals to a "700"-series of numerals, as suggested by the Examiner.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-36, 38 are pending in the application.

The Examiner has objected to the specification because of a number of typographical errors. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the suggested corrections and has amended the specification accordingly. Therefore, Applicant submits that this objection to the claims has been overcome.

The Examiner has rejected claims 18 and 36 as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the claims that do not improperly refer to "the method". Therefore, Applicant submits that this rejection to the claims has been overcome.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-12, 14, 18-29, 31 and 35-37 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hulai et al. (US 2003/0060896). The Examiner has further rejected claims 15-17 and 32-34 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hulai in view of Saulpaugh et al (U.S. 7,010,573). The Examiner does not appear to have explicitly rejected claim 13. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 1 of the application relates to a method for generating a screen element, based on a data object, of a component application executing on a wireless device for display on a user interface of the wireless device, the component application including a data component having at least one data field definition and a screen component having at least one screen element definition, the components being defined in a structured definition language, the method comprising the steps of:

selecting the screen component corresponding to the screen element selected for display;

identifying at least one mapping present in the screen component, *the mapping for specifying a relationship between the screen component and the data component as defined by an identifier representing the mapping*;

selecting the data component mapped by the mapping according to the mapping identifier;

obtaining a data object field value corresponding to the data field definition of the mapped data component;

generating a screen element from the screen element definition to include the data object field value according to the format of the data field definition as defined in the mapped data component.

As described in the specification from page 17, line 14 to page 22, line 25, the component application comprises a plurality of components defined in a structured language, such as XML, and a workflow component defined in a scripting language, such as ECMAScript. The component application is downloaded to the mobile communication device for execution thereon.

Further, as described from page 23, line 25 to page 28, line 14, information for a screen component of the component application and a data component of the component application may overlap. A mapping is identified or generated between the screen component and the data component for the related information. Therefore, when the screen element is generated for display, information for the screen element is retrieved from the mapped data component rather than the screen component.

Further, the mapping between the screen component and the data component allows dynamic data exchange between the screen component and the data component. Accordingly, after the screen component is populated with data from the data component, any change in that data via the screen component is automatically propagated back to the data component.

Accordingly it will be appreciated from the description and claim 1 that one aspect of the present invention relates to the generation of a screen element for display on a device from a data object of a data component using a mapping.

Hulai et al. (US2003/0060896)

In contrast, Hulai does not describe a mapping *for specifying a relationship between the screen component and the data component*. The Examiner has pointed to paragraphs [0085], [0086] and [0097] in Hulai as support for the position that Hulai includes a mapping.

Upon review of Hulai, Applicant submits that paragraphs [0085] and [0086] describe transmitting data from an server side application to a mobile device.

Particularly, paragraph [0085] teaches a server side application that formats its output destined for a mobile device into an expected XML format. The paragraph also teaches the possibility of an interface component to perform this task. Paragraph [0086] teaches using a header of the message output from the server side application to identify the destination mobile device for the message.

Accordingly, these paragraphs identify how a message is addressed and do not teach any mapping specifying a relationship between a screen component and a data component.

Paragraph [0097] relates to elements in the XML screen definition that allow user interaction, such as event and action elements. Specifically, instances of a corresponding event objects and action objects are created for each of these elements. These instance form a part of the virtual machine software. Further, a list of object identifiers is correlated with the element identifiers.

Once again, Applicant submits that this paragraph does not teach any mapping specifying a relationship between a screen component and a data component. In fact this paragraph teaches away from the invention. The mapping between the screen component and the data component allows data sharing between the two components without requiring the instantiation of event and/or action objects.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant submits claim 1 is both novel and invention in view of Hulai and, as such, requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 18, 35, 36 and 38 are similar in scope to claim 1, and therefore a similar argument applies. Accordingly, we submit that the rejection to these claims be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

Since the remaining dependent claims depend from one of the above noted independent claim, since we submit that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is patentable over the prior art. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan Pollack/

Jonathan Pollack
Registration No. 49,065
416 862 5405

Gowling Lafleur Henderson LLP
1 First Canadian Place, Suite 1600
Toronto, Ontario
M5X 1G5

TOR_LAW\6660890\1